number of which exist in the literature. The necessity of such names definitely exists. There is no reason why these two groups of zoologists cannot live together in complete harmony each having what it wants. This would be accomplished if species and subspecies had their own laws and infrasubspecific forms had theirs, neither conflicting in any way with the other set of laws.

As one who has never proposed a name for an infrasubspecific form I am perhaps in as good a position as anyone to propose the foregoing amendments to the Code, as a solution that should be satisfactory to all concerned. Such is the purpose of the foregoing proposals.

CASE No. 16

A NAME FIRST PUBLISHED AS A SYNONYM IS NOT THEREBY MADE AVAILABLE. Article 11(d). (Z.N.(S.) 1570)

By Cyril F. Dos Passos (*Washington Corners, Mendham, N.J.*)

If publication in a synonymy is deemed to be retroactive, as seems to be generally understood, what becomes of such a name that before 1958 had been removed from the synonymy and used for a taxon ? Must it now be replaced ? If so, it would seem that a sentence should be added to this provision to the effect that it is not applicable to such a name for an animal.

Therefore, it is proposed that Article 11(d) be amended to read as follows (new matter in italics) :

(d) Publication in synonymy.—A name first published as a synonym is not thereby made available *unless prior to* 1958 *it has been recognized, removed from the synonymy and used as the name of a taxon.*